REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 3 and 15-23 are pending in the application and stand rejected.

Claims 19-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-patentable subject matter.

Claims 3 and 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite.

Claims 3 and 15-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over US 7,058, 508 to Combs et al. (hereinafter "Combs") in view of JP 200-195372A to Fujimoto et al. (hereinafter "Fujimoto"), further in view of US 2003/0134634 to Nakanishi et al. (hereinafter "Nakanishi"), and further in view of US 6,983,306 to Sameshima et al. (hereinafter "Sameshima").

Claims 3 and 15-23 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. New claims 24-27 are added. The new claims correspond roughly to the canceled claims. No new matter has been added. As discussed below, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not disclose or fairly suggest each and every element as set forth in new claims 24-27. Reconsideration and allowance of the application in view of the amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Rejections under Section 101

Claims 19-23 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. As such, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 101 are now moot.

Rejections under Section 112

The Examiner has requested clarification as to support for some elements in order to ascertain the scope of the claims. While the various elements are discussed throughout the application, Applicants have provided specific page and figure references below for each item mentioned by the Examiner. The page and figure references are based on the application as originally filed. In light of this information, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are not indefinite and request withdrawal of the objections and rejections.

Element	Reference	Drawings
detection unit	p.11, ll.25-28	Fig. 3 (ST0303)
	p.14, ll.17-21	Fig. 5 (0505)
	p.23, ll.10-12	Fig. 12 (1205)
	p.25, l.23-p.26, l.17	Fig. 15
extraction unit	p.11, l.18-p.12, l.2	Fig. 3 (ST0304)
	p.14, ll.17-21	Fig. 5 (0505)
	p.23, ll.10-12	Fig. 12 (1205)
	p.25, l.23-p.26, l.17	Fig. 15
	p.26, ll.26-28	Fig. 16 (ST1601)
creation unit	p.12, ll.2-11	Fig. 3 (ST0305, ST0306)
	p.14, ll.22-28	Fig. 5 (0502)
	p.15, l.13-p.16,l.13	Fig. 6
	p.21, l.19-p.22, l.4	Fig. 11
	p.23, ll.10-12	Fig. 12 (1202)
	p.26, l.28-p.27, l.16	Fig. 16 (ST1602-ST0605)
		Fig. 21
service execution unit	p.12, ll.11-14	Fig. 3 (ST0307)
	p.14, ll.12-13	Fig. 5 (0503)
	p.19, l.20-p.21, l.18	Fig. 10
	p.23, ll. 5-6	Fig. 12 (1203, 1206)
	p.23, l.24-p.24, l.7	
	p.24, l.8-p.25, l.3	Fig. 13
	p.25, ll.4-22	Fig. 14

Claims 24-27

To facilitate examination, Applicants would like to call the Examiner's attention to certain aspects of the claimed invention. As recited in claim 24, the context of a service includes area information. Management of users and context is carried out independently at each device through correspondence information that specifies device linkages. The correspondence

information is updated when context changes (including changes in the area information). Additionally, the correspondence information includes data destination information so that, for example, an application running on a device can perform data I/O with other devices by referring to the correspondence information to obtain a target of the data I/O. In this manner, even when the context has changed, only partial reconfiguration of the devices related to the context change, i.e., change in I/O configuration between the devices, is needed to facilitate continuously providing the service without interrupting or reconfiguring the entire service.

Moreover, according to the claimed invention, extraction and correlating of the devices required for executing a service is carried out both by querying a server having a database with information on multiple devices connected with the network, and by exchanging information directly between the devices which have the functions described in the service scenario. As a result, the present invention improves the stability of the entire system by additionally employing information exchange between the devices and realizing secure provision of continuous service.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103

Applicants offer the following remarks in response to the Final Office Action in order to clarify differences between claims 24-27 and the cited references. Combs, Fujimoto, and Nakanishi were cited in the Final Office Action as disclosing all elements of the distributed system (claim 15). Sameshima was cited for features relating to updates and changes. See, Final Office Action at pages 9-10.

The Final Office Action acknowledged that the combination of Combs and Fujimoto does not disclose the limitation "wherein the service scenario describes functions necessary to provide a service and relationships between the functions" which limitation is also recited in new claim 24. See, Office Action at page 6. Several paragraphs from Nakanishi were cited for the missing limitation. See, Office Action at page 7.

With reference to claim 15, it is noted that no specific citation to the references was given for the claimed creation unit. See, Office Action at pages 8-9. As recited in claim 24, the detection unit and creation unit are used in connection with the service scenario. Per the

claim, the detection unit "detects available devices located in an area wherein the service can be provided to a requester, each available device having one or more of the functions necessary to provide the service according to the context" and the creation unit "creates correspondence information specifying a linkage between the detected devices, the correspondence information comprising function information, device information, process information, and data destination information." Thus, the detection unit and the creation unit operate in furtherance of the service scenario.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited passages of Combs, Fujimoto, and Nakanishi do not disclose or suggest at least the claimed storage, detection, and creation units. Since it has been acknowledged that the combination of Combs/Fujimoto does not disclose a service scenario which describes the functions necessary to provide a service and relationships between the functions, it follows that these references fail to disclose a storage unit which stores a service scenario, a detection unit which detects devices that perform the necessary functions according to the service scenario, or a creation unit which creates correspondence information specifying a linkage between the devices providing the functions described as necessary in the service scenario.

Nakanishi fails to cure these deficiencies. Nakanishi describes a service control apparatus which supports mobile communication devices. See, Abstract. As cited in the Office Action, Nakanishi mentions that the control apparatus can include object retention means ([0009], [0026]) and can provide functions for communication services including packet processing in which a layer higher than the IP layer is restored ([0036], [0059]).

Nakanishi does not disclose or even suggest a service scenario which describes functions necessary to provide a service and relationships between the functions, nor does the reference disclose correspondence information that specifies linkages between detected devices. Nakanishi does not mention function information, device information, process information, and data destination information. Finally, Nakanishi discloses that the detected devices perform one or more of the functions necessary to provide a requested service according a service scenario.

Accordingly, whether taken alone or in combination, Applicants respectfully submit that Combs/Fujimoto/Nakanishi fails to disclose or suggest at least "the storage unit stores a service scenario and a context, wherein the service scenario describes functions necessary to provide a service and relationships between the functions...a detection unit being configured to detect available devices...each available device having one or more of the functions necessary to provide the service according to the context...a creation unit being configured to create correspondence information specifying a linkage between the detected devices, the correspondence information comprising function information, device information, process information, and data destination information."

Sameshima is cited for limitations relating to updates and changes. However, Sameshima does not disclose a service execution unit as set forth in claim 24. In particular, Sameshima does not disclose "a service execution unit which executes the service for the requester of the service by linking the detected devices based on the correspondence information, wherein the service execution unit allocates a plurality of processes on a single device to different users and executes the service for the different users."

Finally, Applicants respectfully submit that the effects of the present invention cannot be achieved through the proposed combination, but instead entail an entire configuration. Simple aggregation of the cited references would not result in achieving a continuous service without interruption or reconfiguration while the service is being executed, and would not realize an improvement of stability of the entire system by exchanging information between the devices. Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that a person of skill in the art would not be motivated to combine the Combs reference (which contemplates a fixed service location) with the other references.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 858-350-6100.

Respectfully submitted,

Steven A. Raney
Reg. No. 58,317

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 858-350-6100
Fax: 415-576-0300
SAR:jlo
62111361 v1